

# ORIGINAL

# FILED

12/08/2016

**Anderson, Diane**

*Ed Smith*

CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of  
Evelyn Popelka <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 2:52 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Opposition to Rule 8.4(g)

Case Number: AF 09-0688

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

# FILED

DEC 08 2016

*Ed Smith*

CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

As a registered Montana voter, I am writing concerning case number AF 09-0688, which deals with the Professional Rules of Conduct for Montana Attorneys. I request that you decline proposed Rule 8.4(g).

I am deeply concerned that this rule takes away the freedom of speech for attorneys and therefore all Montanans.

I strongly urge you to oppose implementing Rule 8.4 (g).

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Evelyn Popelka  
7277 Popelka Rd  
Molt, MT 59057-2004  
[epopelka@itstriangle.com](mailto:epopelka@itstriangle.com)

# ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Linda O'Connor <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 2:52 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Freedom of speech

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

I am writing today after I read the Montana Supreme Court Justices will be deciding on a proposed rule change 8.4(g). After a year of contentious, name calling, hate-filled, campaigns throughout the electoral spectrum, it is time we begin to agree to disagree - politely. Freedom of speech and the right to express oneself is a basic Constitutional right. Regardless of one's beliefs, that fundamental right should never be in doubt. Anyone and everyone, including lawyers, have a right to their opinion and the freedom to express it. No one has to agree, and that's all right. I am opposed to changing any right of any person! I urge you, therefore, to vote "no" to the above rule change. Thank you.

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Linda O'Connor  
402 Little St  
Glendive, MT 59330-2846  
(406) 377-2871  
[lindao@midrivers.com](mailto:lindao@midrivers.com)

**FILED**

DEC 08 2016

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

# ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Douglas Austin <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 2:52 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Proposed adoption of Rule 8.4(g) of the Montana Rules of Professional Conduct

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

Dear Honorable Justices:

Recently I read an opinion that if this proposed rule is adopted, a lawyer could lose her job by publicly stating that marriage is between a man and a woman. "Really?" I thought. But as I pondered the ramifications of the proposed new rule, I realized that this opinion was not so far fetched.

The proposed new rule would declare that it is professional misconduct "to engage in conduct... that is harassment or discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion, national origin, ethnicity, disability, age, sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status or socioeconomic status.." We all know that the ultimate potential consequence of professional misconduct is disbarment.

Here is the problem: There are many reasonable, compassionate, fair-minded people who believe, as a matter of conscience and faith, that homosexuality is a moral, not a civil rights issue. Many Christians believe that same sex attraction, as well as various other inclinations or behaviors, if pursued, will drive a wedge in our relationship with a holy God. Adherents to other faiths are of the same opinion. Followers of Christ believe that God, in His mercy and grace, knowing of our inability to remove this wedge by our own strength, sent His Son to bridge the gap, so that all who cross that bridge can be reconciled not only with God, but with one another. Some are offended by this statement of faith. Others have found great hope in it. So has it been throughout history, from the manger to the cross to the present.

A few years ago Montanans amended our Constitution to confirm, by a large majority, that marriage is between a man and a woman, which had been assumed for centuries. This was recently overturned by a 5 to 4 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. Are those attorneys who agreed with the minority in that case now precluded from expressing an opinion that the decision was morally and legally incorrect, because some will perceive expression of that opinion as harassment or discrimination? Is our choice to remain silent, or to be disciplined? Is this not a slippery slope leading to thought police or totalitarianism?

I have been practicing law for 41 years in a small town in Montana. I have had clients who are homosexual, or who engaged in other behaviors I did not personally agree with. I respected them. They respected me. I provided them with the legal services they needed. What if one of those clients confided in me that he was considering marriage with his partner. He was not sure, however, and asked for my opinion. Could I suggest that he seek counsel with his pastor, or a

**FILED**

**DEC 08 2016**

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

trusted family member, or a trusted friend? Could I point out that many of the same benefits of marriage could be obtained by use of wills, durable powers of attorney, medical advance directives and beneficiary designations? Or would I be running the risk that his partner would report me to the Commission on Practice?

Speaking of the Commission on Practice, are they the correct venue to sort out the constitutional rights of freedom of expression, freedom of religion and the perception of harassment and discrimination that this proposed rule would introduce? Do they really want to take on this role? To be reported to the Commission on Practice, by the way, even if exonerated, is a scary, time-consuming and expensive proposition.

Several years ago I was the Court-Appointed Guardian Ad Litem for a boy who had been sexually assaulted by an adult male. He had various problems, and had been sent to an out of state treatment facility. I received a report that he was experiencing confusion about his sexual identity. The staff had referred him to an LGBT support group. I was appalled and I objected. This young man, whose physical sexuality had been prematurely stimulated, was being steered to a life style he most likely would not have chosen but for the fact that he had been assaulted. Had this proposed rule been in effect at that time, would I have been reported to the Commission on Practice?

In recent months the Montana Lawyer had an article regarding the lack of legal services in remote, rural areas of Montana. It should be noted that the existing attorneys living and practicing in those small communities perform countless hours of free and reduced-fee legal services for their neighbors. It will not help matters if those attorneys who subscribe to the statement of faith noted above, are excluded from the practice of law. A few years ago I was privileged to assist with the drafting of a petition, initiated by local churches in Superior, Montana, denouncing a small number of white supremacists who were holding a "national convention" on the outskirts of town. The response from the community was an overwhelming rebuke of that bigotry.

It is entirely unfair, however, to label as bigots and homophobes, those who respectfully disagree with the homosexual lifestyle on moral grounds.

The proposed rule has been submitted by the American Bar Association.

I question whether it is needed in Montana. What is broken that needs to be fixed? The existing Rules of Professional Conduct hold attorneys to a high standard. If an attorney's conduct demonstrates improper prejudice, he or she will be held accountable under the existing rules, or he or she will be shunned by potential clients and the community. In the marketplace of ideas, the light of day will reveal the truth.

There are many other issues in our society which need our attention.

Let us who are in the trenches not only continue to serve the everyday legal needs of our neighbors, but let us also focus our attention on seeking justice for the poor, the orphan, the widow and the oppressed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very truly yours,

Douglas R. Austin

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mr. Douglas Austin  
29 Standing Rock Ct  
PO Box 224  
Superior, MT 59872-9384  
(406) 822-4771  
dougastinlaw@blackfoot.net

**ORIGINAL**

**Anderson, Diane**

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Peggy Sue Miller <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 2:52 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Rule 8.4(g)

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

Please oppose the implementation of rule 8.4(g). This rule is a violation of the free exercise of religion. It is a violation of the freedom of speech and the press. Even if you personally do not agree with a particular belief, a lawyer should not be disbarred for holding it.

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Peggy Sue Miller  
222 Arbour Dr  
Kalispell, MT 59901-2163  
[8mtmillers@gmail.com](mailto:8mtmillers@gmail.com)

**FILED**

**DEC 08 2016**

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

# ORIGINAL

**Anderson, Diane**

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Michael Sutter <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 1:52 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** I STRONGLY oppose the proposed rule change 8.4(g)

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

**DEC 08 2016**

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

This rule is a violation of the free exercise of religion & of the freedom of speech and of the press. Even if you don't agree with a belief, lawyers ought not to be disbarred for holding it.

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mr. Michael Sutter  
PO Box 925  
Kila, MT 59920-0925  
[mikesutter007@hotmail.com](mailto:mikesutter007@hotmail.com)

# ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Tedd Northcutt <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 1:52 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** No to proposed rule change 8.4

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

**DEC 08 2016**

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

I do not feel that the proposed rule change 8.4 is beneficial nor necessary to Montana. We do want lawyers to be able to follow their consciences and beliefs...these are the basic rights of the constitution and Declaration of Independence. Let's say no to this change!

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mr. Tedd Northcutt  
927 Coyote Ln  
Butte, MT 59701-9669  
(406) 593-0101  
[hqtedd@hotmail.com](mailto:hqtedd@hotmail.com)

Anderson, Diane

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Steven Sem <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 1:52 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Proposed Rule 8.4(g)

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

TO: Members of the Montana Supreme Court  
SUBJECT: Proposed new Rule 8.4(g), Professional Rules of Conduct

December 7, 2016

Honorable Members of the Court,

As a concerned citizen I want to express my concern regarding your possible adoption of Rule 8.4(g) of the Professional Rules of Conduct,.

I ask that you reject this proposed rule because it:

- violates the free speech protections guaranteed to individuals and the press by our Constitution
- imposes on the free exercise of religion for Christians in our society
- represents a huge overreach of government authority

This rule, if adopted, will stifle the above freedoms and limit the deliberative process of open, free debate which is a hallmark of our legal system. Members of the Bar should not be disbarred or reprimanded for holding a belief that may not agree with others'.

Protecting the viewpoints of all citizens is the responsibility of our legal system. However, protecting the feelings of a few should not undermine the rights of the many.

Finally, limiting the constitutional protections of our citizens should be a legislative process, not an administrative or regulatory one.

Please reject the proposed rule.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Respectfully,  
Steven R. Sem  
221 29th Ave NE  
Great Falls, MT 59404

**FILED**

DEC 08 2016

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA



# ORIGINAL

**Anderson, Diane**

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Donna Weiner <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 1:22 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Freedom of Beliefs

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

DEC 08 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

It is disgraceful that this is even being considered. It is a violation of the free exercise of religion that this country was founded upon and a violation of freedom of speech.

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Donna Weiner  
1301 Le Grande Cannon Blvd  
Helena, MT 59601-6134  
[donnaweiner@aol.com](mailto:donnaweiner@aol.com)

# ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Lawrence Heppner <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 1:00 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Defending our freedoms

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

DEC 08 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

Please consider opposing the proposed rule change 8.4g. We seem to slowly one by one be losing our freedoms. This rule change would seem to be a further effort to restrict our religious freedom.

Minorities seem to be able to say anything they please, whereas the rest of us are continually having our free speech muzzled. Please think this matter through thoroughly and consider every one, not just a select group.

Thank You

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mr. Lawrence Heppner  
437 Ueland  
Westby, MT 59275-9728  
(406) 385-7810  
[lonetree@nemont.net](mailto:lonetree@nemont.net)

# ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Sharon Lee <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 12:30 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Marriage

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

DEC 08 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

I want to take a few minutes of your time to say that this ruling violates our freedom of speech and our free exercise of our beliefs.

Even if you don't agree with a belief, lawyers ought not to be disbarred for holding it.

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Sharon Lee  
PO Box 369  
Pablo, MT 59855-0369  
[mike.57chev@gmail.com](mailto:mike.57chev@gmail.com)

# ORIGINAL

**Anderson, Diane**

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Gregroy Ammondson <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 12:30 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Marriage and the Courts

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

DEC 08 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

To the MT Supreme Court, Justices,

I am writing to express my opposition to the possible rule change 8.4  
(g.)

Please do not change the rules regarding the freedom of lawyers to speak in public and state their belief about marriage. Please do not penalize a lawyer for saying that marriage is between one man and one woman. If you create this rule change, you will violate the free exercise of religion. Most people who believe that marriage is between man and woman base their belief upon the Bible. There is no need to reject a lawyer because of their belief about marriage. Please don't make this rule change.

Sincerely yours,  
Gregory Ammondson  
5600 Micheal Lane  
Lolo, Mt 59847

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mr. Gregroy Ammondson  
185 Westgate Way  
PO Box 1032  
Florence, MT 59833-6501  
(406) 273-4650  
[ammondson@justice.com](mailto:ammondson@justice.com)

# ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Linda Phelps <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 12:22 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Considering Rule 8.4

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

DEC 08 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

Please consider my request to appose Rule 8.4. It seems terribly unfair that a person would lose their form of livelihood just because they mention marriage should be between a man and a woman. This, to me, keeps our liberty of choice for religious beliefs from being able to be spoken.

I lived in OR when a family decided because of their religious beliefs not to make a cake for a same sex couple. This family has had to close their bakery and it has caused great hardship for them financially just because they made a choice they felt was their right. I don't see where religious freedom is being made to work fairly in our culture. Please consider apposing this ridiculous ruling because if this goes through what else will they take away from us in the line of freedom.

Thanks for reading and considering my views on this matter.

Sincerely,  
Linda M Phelps  
93 Northern Lights Blvd  
Kalispell, MT 59901  
[lindaphelps44@yahoo.com](mailto:lindaphelps44@yahoo.com)

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Linda Phelps  
93 Northern Lights Blvd  
Kalispell, MT 59901-3027  
[lindaphelps@yahoo.com](mailto:lindaphelps@yahoo.com)

**ORIGINAL**

**Anderson, Diane**

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Bob Brannon <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 12:22 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Discriminatory paragraph (g) to Rule 8.4

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

DEC 08 2016

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

Dear Supreme Court Justices,

I am writing regarding the proposed change to Rule 8.4, which would add paragraph (g). I have both read and researched this language and proposed change and I am left dumbfounded. It is incomprehensible to me that the highest judicial body in the state could, much less would, even consider such a discriminatory action. There is no way to interpret this rule change other than as unconstitutional, and this from a body charged with upholding not only Montana's constitution but our nation's constitution as well!

This rule change would remove the right of free speech, freedom of religion and the freedoms of assembly and press for Montana lawyers.

The only motivation that is apparent for this rule change is to accomplish these freedom infringements in favor of whatever the Montana Bar Association might want to be espoused.

I implore you as a body to unanimously reject this change on its face as being clearly unconstitutional. You must do this to protect Montana lawyers from these freedom infringements. I further implore you to admonish Chief Justice McGrath for even allowing this measure to be considered. And finally, I implore you to admonish the Montana Bar Association, if not the American Bar Association as well, for asking you to consider this language. By license, those in the these associations are required to practice the law to uphold rights, not to attempt to infringe on the rights of others in favor of an elite few.

In addition, it is highly alarming that this type of action only became apparent by the efforts of someone who must have been "inside" the system as it was just made public today, only two days before the comment period is to close. This is so even though this measure was proposed almost a month and a half ago. Does this now mean citizens must research daily, on their own, what the Montana Supreme Court and the Montana Bar Association might be doing?

Please, take measures to ensure these type of controversial unconstitutional actions are fully exposed to the public. Again, I implore you as a body to unanimously reject this change.

--

Best Regards,

Bob Brannon

3413 Highway 287  
Sheridan, MT 59749  
406-533-9539  
[bbrannon24@gmail.com](mailto:bbrannon24@gmail.com)

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mr. Bob Brannon  
3413 Mt Highway 287  
Sheridan, MT 59749-9558  
(406) 533-9539  
[bbrannon24@gmail.com](mailto:bbrannon24@gmail.com)

# ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Karen Redman <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 12:22 PM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Rule Change 8.4(g)

**FILED**

DEC 08 2016

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

I am strongly opposed to this rule change as I believe everyone has the right to their own opinion especially if those opinions are based on a strongly held religious belief. I believe it is wrong to penalize someone for what should be a freedom of speech issue.

Thank you for considering my opinion on this matter Karen Redman  
513 Sherwood Drive  
Columbus, MT  
59019

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Karen Redman  
513 Sherwood Dr  
Columbus, MT 59019-7140  
[kred60@yahoo.com](mailto:kred60@yahoo.com)



ORIGINAL

**Anderson, Diane**

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Davida Constant <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 11:52 AM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Opposition to Proposed Change to Rule 8.4(g)

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

DEC 03 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

This rule is a violation of the free exercise of religion. This rule is a violation of the freedom of speech and of the press. Even if you don't agree with a belief, lawyers ought not be disbarred for holding it.

Thank you for your consideration.

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Davida Constant  
31 Shea Way  
Kalispell, MT 59901  
[bdconstant83@gmail.com](mailto:bdconstant83@gmail.com)

ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Jennifer Thorne <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 11:52 AM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Free Exercise of Religious Beliefs

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

Do not hinder our free speech in this area. That would be a major mistake.

People should not be penalized for believing in traditional marriage.

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jennifer Thorne  
951 Sandstone Gulch Rd  
Florence, MT 59833-6678  
(406) 544-8743  
[jthorne4@msn.com](mailto:jthorne4@msn.com)

FILED

DEC 08 2016

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Daniel mahn <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 11:52 AM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Right to opinion

FILED

Dec 7, 2016

DEC 08 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

I understand that Montana's Supreme Court is considering changing the rules for lawyers! Under the proposed new rule, if a lawyer says anything that might be deemed "discriminatory" on the basis of "sexual orientation" or "gender identity," that lawyer could be disbarred. For example if a lawyer happens to believe that marriage is between one man and one women, that could be deemed discriminatory and he or she could be disbarred. I believe that would discriminate against anyone who holds that particular Christian value, and that would be wrong itself?

This rule is a violation of the free exercise of religion.

This rule is a violation of the freedom of speech and of the press.

Even if you don't agree with a belief, lawyers ought not to be disbarred for holding it.

I appreciate you taking comments.

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mr. Daniel mahn  
5796 Ellison Ln  
Florence, MT 59833-6606  
(406) 258-0334  
[danm@vemcoinc.com](mailto:danm@vemcoinc.com)

# ORIGINAL

Anderson, Diane

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Thannon Holst <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 11:52 AM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Marriage IS between one man and one woman

**FILED**

DEC 08 2016

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

I find it difficult to believe that we are willing to punish people for what they believe and say. We do not discipline for pro gay, and I think it's ridiculous we would discipline for pro family. Let's not let the minority make the rules for the majority. I strongly oppose the rule change. I hope you reject it for myself, my daughter, and my daughter's future children. Sincerely, A woman married to a man, Thannon Holst

1138 avenue D  
Billings Montana 59102

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Thannon Holst  
1138 Avenue D  
Billings, MT 59102-3240  
[thannonjeremy@gmail.com](mailto:thannonjeremy@gmail.com)

# ORIGINAL

**Anderson, Diane**

---

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of  
KEVIN STEEN <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 11:52 AM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** Proposed rule change 8.4? Assault on Lawyers statewide

Dec 7, 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

It is not the job of the Judicial Branch of the State Government to legislate and it is not to job of the Legislative Branch to interpret the law. I believe this is yet another example of government overreach and a breach of the separation of powers designed to protect the American people from those we have chosen to be our leaders who choose to ignore us and do as they see right in their own eyes. This is a direct assault on a Christian's 1st Amendment rights as an American citizen. Don't be yet another example the out and out arrogance that is continuing to plague many of the elected leaders our system of government. Thank you for giving us a hearing and I will be in prayer for you and our chosen leaders as you continue the work for our dear nation. God bless you.

Yours Respectfully,  
Kevin D. Steen

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mr. KEVIN STEEN  
521 N Sewell Ave  
Miles City, MT 59301-3937  
(406) 853-5958  
[neetsteen@gmail.com](mailto:neetsteen@gmail.com)

**FILED**

DEC 08 2016

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Anderson, Diane

**ORIGINAL**

**From:** Montana Family Foundation <communications@montanafamily.org> on behalf of Eileen Rodriguez <communications@montanafamily.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 7, 2016 11:52 AM  
**To:** Court, SCclerk  
**Subject:** opposition to proposed Rule 8.4(g)

**FILED**

Dec 7, 2016

DEC 08 2016

Honorable Ed Smith  
P.O. Box 203003  
Helena, MT 59620-3003

*Ed Smith*  
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF MONTANA

Dear Justices Honorable Smith,

I am writing today to express my opposition to the proposed rule change 8.4(g).

Regarding case number AF 09-0688 concerning proposed Rule 8.4(g) of the Professional Rules of Conduct for Montana Attorneys, I request you decline the adoption of this rule. This rule threatens freedom of speech of one class, which threatens freedom of speech for each and everyone of us.

Please do not adopt this proposed change to Rule 8.4(g) for the sake of preserving our present freedoms, as well as the freedoms of our children.

Sincerely,

Eileen Rodriguez

A concerned Montana Citizen

I hope you'll reject this rule change.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Eileen Rodriguez  
4643 S Woodhaven Way  
Billings, MT 59106-2493  
[moltmt@yahoo.com](mailto:moltmt@yahoo.com)